

**CHESSINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**MEETING OF FULL GOVERNING BODY HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 JANUARY 2013 AT 6.30 PM AT THE COLLEGE**

**Present:**

- Brenda Brevitt (BB) Chair
- Nicola Sheppard (NS) Vice Chair
- Rob Neidermaier-Reed (RNR) Principal
- Andy Withers (AW)
- Ben Laker (BL)
- Paul Jarvis (PJ)
- Mary Golletz (MG)
- Kay Thompson (KT)
- Anirudh Chaturvedi (AC)
- Adrian Dally (AD)
- Catherine Kidwell (CK)
- Chris Johnson (CJ)

Total as per instrument 16, total in place: 13 (TB resigned, CJ now a governor)  
12

**Associate Members present:** David Carter

**In attendance:**

Clerk: Jackie Dutton  
Paul Moralee (PM), Olivia Page (OP), Mark Clutterbuck (MC)

Graham Willett RBK SIP (GW)

**Actions  
FGB12-13/02:**

1.	<p><b>Welcomes</b></p> <p>BB welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending.</p> <p>BB welcomed Anirudh Chaturvedi as a new parent governor and also Graham Willett, RBK School Improvement Partner (SIP). GW has been working closely with the College and will be particularly monitoring progress on the Ofsted report improvement plan. Everyone present introduced themselves and described their role.</p>	
2	<p><b>GB Administration/Committees</b></p> <p>It was noted that these meetings were open meeting , subject to the discretion of Chair and Principal</p> <p>BB noted the resignation of Tricia Bamford as an LA governor, effective 15 January 2013. BB recorded formally her thanks for Tricia for her contributions on the Governing Body. BB would also write to Tricia personally.</p> <p>BB noted that the term of office for AW had ended in September 2011 and at the time the College was waiting to see if it was to become an academy shortly so this renewal was kept</p>	<p><b>001</b></p> <p>BB to write to TB-Done</p>

	<p>on pending. However the College was still waiting to determine this so AW needed to be reappointed as a community governor. BB proposed this and all governors voted in favour (associate members were not eligible to vote). CJ was currently an associate member but was willing to fill the vacancy for community governor – this was proposed by BB and unanimously approved by governors (again associate members did not vote). The Clerk would notify RBK of the changes.</p> <p>The term of office for Paul Jarvis and Mary Golletz would end on 24 March 2013 and the College would be required to hold an election at that point. MG would be eligible to stand but not PJ. However, if not enough parent governors were nominated to fill the parent governor vacancies, then the College could appoint PJ directly. DC asked about the LA governor post and BB confirmed that LA posts were not being filled by RBK pending academy status.</p> <p>A list had been distributed showing the revised committee structure and it was noted that NS would come off H &amp; S and TB would no longer be a governor. BB was hoping to arrange some training on staff disciplinary and appeals (later confirmed as 4 February 2013). All governors agreed the committee structure. BB noted that commitment to the committees was very important, and especially so in this post-Ofsted phase.</p>	<p>002 Clerk to notify changes to Gov Body</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Register of interest</b></p> <p>RNR declared in interest in Agenda item 11 – Performance Appraisal - and would leave at this point, alongside all staff governors.</p> <p>There were no other declarations of interest. The Clerk reminded those who had yet to do so to submit forms as soon as possible in order to ensure the College was compliant with the regulations governing this requirement.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>These had been received from Simon Hacker due to a domestic power failure. These were accepted.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Ofsted inspection and Report</b></p> <p>The report had been distributed. RNR stated that the inspection had been a different experience to the previous Ofsted, however the Report did not contain any surprises, which showed the College’s self evaluation was accurate.</p> <p>RNR stated that the previous report (2011) had 27 component judgements within 4 key areas, this time there were 4 plus 1 overall judgement. All 4 areas were given Grade 3 – ‘Requires improvement’ and it was felt that this was an accurate judgement. The College was improving and the report recognised that but also recognised that there was some distance to go to get a ‘Good’ judgement. Achievement and teaching still needed to improve and those really drove the other judgements. Behaviour in the building and outside the classrooms was recognised as being the nearest to ‘Good’, Leadership and management could not be assessed as ‘Good’ if the other judgements were lower. RNR said that the SLT knew that results and teaching have got to be better more quickly. Behaviour was only criticised in the report when it was connected to poor teaching.</p> <p>BB asked for comments and questions and reminded governors to highlight confidential</p>	

<p>items, which would be recorded in Part 2.</p> <p>CJ asked about the first page of the report and the 5 bullet points of areas to improve. He asked if the basics were in place to enable this, for example planning and marking not having been done or done properly – was there a system that covered all the aspects. RNR said there was a system in place but it was not good enough yet in two main areas – raise achievement and improve leadership and management. There was rigorous checking on progress and teachers’ planning. There had been an issue of capacity in the SLT in the past but this had been resolved in the Autumn term. There was a system in place to ensure that all teachers have a lesson plan and there were now 2 deputies monitoring this, one focusing on achievement, and one focusing on teaching and learning strategy, including scrutiny and planning. At the SLT meeting the previous day the team had looked at procedures for checking marking and grading teachers on marking. This had been done in the past and there had been lesson observations but it had not been done effectively enough to bring about the achievements needed. KT asked if the marking policy was now finalised and OP said that it was – there had been a policy before but it was out of date. CJ asked if there were procedures for every aspect highlighted and RNR felt that there was – there were lesson observations, learning walk judgements, teachers’ performance assessed on basis of results and also on marking and feedback. RNR stated that advice had been given from Ursuline School, Wimbledon, through the ‘Securing Good’ initiative.</p> <p>AW asked if teaching staff had responded positively to the need for improvement. RNR said that there was still a minority of teachers who considered improvement was hampered by students’ challenging behaviour. RNR had presented the Ofsted report to staff and it clearly stated that behaviour was poor only where there was poor teaching. Teaching staff have been rebriefed on this. CJ asked if the teaching staff knew that they have to make changes and RNR said that there was now a much stronger understanding on this.</p> <p>PJ said that the College should be congratulated on the work done in the past, and for the accurate self-evaluation that meant the school was already aware of what was highlighted in the report. He stated that a lot of work had been done under the current Principal on behaviour and to get the results achieved so far. If as much work was to be done in future then he felt the next Ofsted report would be good. This should be seen as a tool to use to move the next step of the way. RNR indicated that the previous two reports had perhaps been generous in some of the judgements, which masked the real improvement required and that the current report presented a more accurate picture</p> <p>NS stated that if the report in 2011 was over generous this might mean parents would think the College had slipped. RNR said the report does say the College had improved but it would be understandable for parents to think that. One parent had contacted RNR and he would be meeting that parent the following week.</p> <p>RNR said the College had just completed a survey of parental attitudes towards the College by an external company, Kirk and Rowell. BB asked if the College could identify a critical path to failure that could be identified and improved. AC noted that in industry there were key performance indicators and asked if the College had a similar arrangement. RNR confirmed the College Development Plan contains these although that terminology was not used.</p> <p>MG stated that the governors were criticised for not being involved enough in the self-evaluation process and asked what had not been shared. It was noted that particular strengths included governance but that could not be assessed as ‘Good’ if the results were not good.</p>	
---	--

GW noted that language was critical – governors should demonstrate their involvement and own the self-evaluation process. He noted that this governing body was much stronger than it was before but that point was made in the report. The action plan does indicate in the framework that governors will be demanding and challenging the College. GW said that the final judgements were the right ones to enable this College to move forward.

BB stated that there was a strong appetite for governors to be involved in this. RNR had sent out Action Plan frameworks (with apologies for distributing these that day but he had been working on them since the inspectors left). The plans focused on two success criteria, the main one for achievement was 57% of students achieving 5 A- C GCSEs, including Maths and English.

The target for the percentage of lessons judged good or outstanding was 80%. There would be a rigorous framework for monitoring and evaluating with clear dates for reviewing and a clear structure running from line management through to the review processes for SLT. GW would be attending weekly Deputy Head meetings. CCC had been assigned high priority status with RBK and so would be getting more support from the LA. Nick Whitfield, Director of Children Services for RBK, would be chairing a termly meeting to review progress too.

BB said that the Q & S committee had scheduled additional monitoring meetings and would meet the following week with SLT to agree a monitoring framework and increase the number of governors. CJ asked about getting an external perspective on progress and RNR said that 15 March was an inset day where every teacher will visit another school - support from other schools was also being co-ordinated by OP. Education Kingston also provides external expertise, and the College was looking at getting expertise to look at technology via Surrey. Accountability would be through Education Kingston and RBK. GW said that as SIP he would come in regularly and challenge – he had been due to come in the day of the Ofsted visit to do his termly SIP visit but this would be rearranged. The Inspection Team had been led by a serving Headteacher who understood the context and recognised the strength and development that was possible. The College had been given a High Priority now so that extra resources could be allocated and GW could prioritise his time for the College.

GW said that from November 2012, Ofsted wanted any school subject to improvement to have visits from HMI (Her Majesty's Inspectorate) and this was a new requirement. So far 3 schools in RBK had been judged as requiring improvement in the Autumn Term and the first monitoring visit by HMI was the previous Friday – this looked at how the school had responded to the areas for improvement. The visit for the College would be within 4 – 6 weeks of the publication of report (14 December) so would probably be around February half term, with up to 5 days' notice. The visit to date in the other school was being done in the flavour of a partnership approach.

CJ said that this was a new issue for EK (Education Kingston) and asked if EK had the capacity to do this. GW said that the capacity was not only within EK but they would also use support from other schools/Heads. Two years ago the College's financial situation would not have allowed the College to put this right – there was now a better situation for finance, SLT capacity and governance.

CJ asked about other self reviews apart from the inset day observations and RNR said that there was a good programme using the Securing Good network of schools partnered with

<p>Ursuline , which was an outstanding school. There were also joint lesson observations with Southborough (a Good school) locally. There had been teaching staff visits to Hollyfield and AST (Advanced Skills Teachers) visits to the College.</p> <p>OP also noted there would be subject reviews in critical areas. RNR had drafted an advertisement for two AST (Advanced Skills Teacher) teachers (Maths and English) who would work alongside colleagues to improve the quality of teaching in others. .</p> <p>BB noted that some of the visits on the inset day would be to primary schools where there was much to learn from good practice in pedagogy.</p> <p>AW asked if there were any links to SEN schools and RNR said that the College’s former Head of Inclusion was now Head of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) providing a direct connection to raising achievement. College students placed there counted towards the College’s overall results. GW reflected that there was still a mindset about lack of expectation by some teachers. RNR said that this was much smaller than it was 3 years ago but he was disappointed that it was still there at all. It was now recognised that the problem is not the children. AC said that assessing motivation is more difficult. RNR stated that he trusted the outcomes of lesson observations, which were triangulated against EducationKingston visits and Ofsted judgements. CJ asked if there were key milestones for teaching staff that showed when an end point was reached . RNR said that a protocol had been sent out this week to colleagues referring to the lesson observation programme.</p> <p>CJ asked if the College was solely focused on the Ofsted plan; RNR noted that progress on the academy status remained an issue. There was great engagement in sport, music and drama productions and the Tanzania fund raising appeal but responsibility was spread across the SLT. PM absorbed much of the responsibility for non-teaching and learning priorities, with Michelle Pillbrow offering additional capacity. SLT had reviewed that it was possible to carry on with those activities though some had been pared down. There was a moratorium on all spending with the focus on ‘Will it add to teaching or achievement’. It was felt to be important not to lose sight of what makes a good school. Academy status and the Tanzania project have been reviewed and there was a real sense of purpose that had a positive effect on other work. The Academy working group was actively looking at its priority with respect to the Ofsted plan.</p> <p>RNR said the core activity was achievement, teaching and learning. The College had other purposes too – social, moral, spiritual and cultural areas were also judged in the report and there were reasonably positive comments there. BB noted that there was a high level of distributed leadership in the Tanzania project and that it was not just taking up SLT time. The Tanzania project had been initiated as a response to previous Ofsted recommendation and was a good thing to do. PJ felt that it was not just about getting a good Ofsted report, there was a need for a wider view of the world . CJ agreed with this but wanted to be sure the issues had been prioritised. RNR noted that the Action Plan for CCC for Spring and Summer gave a good summary of the priorities.</p> <p>AC asked about the parent survey and the Kirk and Rowell survey – RNR responded that the parent view, and the Kirk and Rowell survey, was that this was a good school. In the Ofsted report, the parents who responded were positive. The response rates were poor for Ofsted although Kirk and Rowell felt their response rate was acceptable. The College wants to find different ways to hear what parents were saying and was seeking other ways to get concerns shared. It was agreed that the Executive Summary for the Kirk and Rowell survey would be</p>	<p>003 RNR to distribute Exec</p>
---	-----------------------------------

	<p>shared with governors by RNR. BB said that her preliminary assessment against governance self-assessment criteria showed that good progress had been made since the last assessment in 2008 but there accountability could be improved, which involved hearing from parents and students. She felt there was a need a strategy away day for governors to work on areas like this. She had received an offer from an external chair to talk about being more productive as a governing body.</p> <p>BB checked if there were any other issues on the report to go through – RNR said that the College knew where it was and it was encouraging that it showed improvements had been made, though it was recognised that this was not fast enough and this needed to accelerate. GW said that the inspection was very challenging and it was right that this was not yet a good school, judged against the key indicators. There was a genuine belief and conviction that the SLT now had the capacity, and that the governing body had the capacity, to make the changes. As leaders the governors had to drive the improvements and changes to bring up the improvements in the exam results and there was now an urgency for this.</p> <p>KT asked what the realistic time frame was and GW replied that the summer 2013 results were critical to show progress towards stronger and better outcomes. RNR said that the projections were encouraging – there was good data now to show that although not guaranteed, it was achievable. The next couple of years were going to be challenging with the target of the quality of education for children here to become genuinely good , then outstanding. The governors would need to carry the staff through that process. There would be teaching staff movement but there would be a core staff who move through that process.</p> <p>BB thanked GW for his help and support. GW stated that he was happy to support and was confident in the College’s ability to improve.</p> <p>GW left at 8 pm</p>	<p>summary</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Academy update.</b></p> <p>This was discussed under Part 2. Following this MC, OP and PM left at 8.15 pm.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Minutes of meeting held on 19 September 2012</b></p> <p>These were agreed as accurate and signed by the Chair.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Matters arising from Minutes of meeting held on 19 September 2012</b></p> <p>1 JD would be chasing outstanding Declarations of Interest after the meeting.                  2 MC had distributed report                  3 AC had been elected as parent governor                  4 Children in care governor - BB would be meeting with Michelle Pillbrow to discuss safeguarding in general and the role on the governing body.                  5 Open evening dates – RNR and PM to progress. It was noted that GW had been incredulous about the College being given a date right at the end again.</p>	<p>004 Declarations to be chased by Clerk</p> <p>005 BB to discuss safeguarding role</p> <p>006 Open evening dates to be progressed</p>

		RNR/PM
9.	<p><b>Chair's Report</b></p> <p>This had been distributed.</p> <p>BB had taken emergency powers to approve working documents for the behaviour policy and complaints policies. Final versions would come back at the next FGB meeting.</p> <p>The First aid policy was an agenda item.</p>	
10	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>The Medicines and First Aid policy had been based on the LA policy and reviewed by the Health &amp; Safety/Asset group in the Autumn Term . PM had made amendments and this was the final version. There was a typo at the top of page 5 under 'Students refusing medication' where the last sentence of this paragraph should read 'If necessary the college will call the emergency services' This was approved and would be reviewed in two years' time.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Performance Management</b></p> <p>The Principal and all staff governors left the meeting.</p> <p>The performance management process for the Principal had been carried out by the Performance Management Group who had met with the Principal and GW on 5 December 2012, before the deadline of 31 December 2012. All targets had been met and a one point increment was recommended. After discussion this was agreed unanimously.</p>	
12	<p><b>Summary reports from Committees</b></p> <p><b>The Principal and all staff governors returned to the meeting.</b></p> <p>The minutes for the following meetings had been distributed.</p> <p>Q &amp;S: 10 Oct, 14 Nov  Community: 7 Nov  HSAG: 4 Oct and 28 Nov  FMEG: 24 Oct</p> <p>AD had attended new governor training with RBK and he was asked about the course as the next course was on 9 Feb that AC might wish to attend. AD said that he had talked to people from other schools and covered basics of schools policies, what is a governor, the accountability and critical friend roles. He had also had a meeting after the course to sound out some ideas too. He felt it was very effective training and BB would send details to AC.</p> <p>BB was hoping to arrange training on safeguarding for all governors.</p> <p>CJ asked about students who could not afford trips and if the College made provision for this. RNR said that it did, sometimes from school fund. There was a Ski trip where some were put off by cost but anything that is necessary for the curriculum will happen even if pupils needed help with the cost.</p>	<p>007  BB to send  AC training  details to AC</p>
13	<p><b>Minutes and Referrals</b></p> <p>The Ofsted plan would be considered at the Q &amp; S committee.</p>	<p>008  Q &amp; S to</p>

	<p>Student council dates to be circulated to see if governors wished to attend and also it was noted that students can come to governors’ meetings as observers.</p>	<p>consider Ofsted report</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p><b>Moment of Reflection</b></p> <p>BB asked the governors if they felt the action plans following the report from Ofsted were sufficiently robust.</p> <p>CJ felt that a good start had been made and he had confidence in the SLT. He would like more detail on what would be reported to the governing body and whether the governing body can be assured of that. It was noted the Q &amp; S meeting will look at that.</p> <p>AC asked if there was a reward system in place for teaching staff. RNR said that the Government had just announced that pay would be related to performance for all teaching staff. The SLT knew this announcement was coming and had already run a training session with faculty leaders and others who conduct appraisals. RNR felt that performance related pay does motivate provided that those who deserve it are seen to be rewarded and those who didn’t were not.</p>	
	<p>The meeting finished with a Powerpoint presentation by BB on the elements of success. (Bradley Wiggins) <b>The date of the next meeting was 20 March 2013, although this could be subject to change if a decision about academy status was needed before then.</b></p> <p>Following Part 2 items the meeting finished at 8.50 pm</p>	